

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

David James,	) C/A No. 8:11-01643-JMC-JDA
	)
Petitioner,	)
	)
vs.	)
	)
Warden Robert M. Stevenson, Broad River Correctional Institution,	) Report and Recommendation
	)
Respondent.	)
	)

---

David James (“Petitioner”), a self-represented state prisoner, filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) D.S.C., the undersigned is authorized to review such petitions and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court. For the reasons that follow, the undersigned recommends the District Court dismiss the petition in this case without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of this *pro se* petition pursuant to the Rules Governing Section 2254 Proceedings for the United States District Court, the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA), Pub. L. No. 104-132, 110 Stat. 1214, and other habeas corpus statutes. The review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983).

This Court is required to liberally construe *pro se* documents. *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976). Such *pro se* documents are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1978), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a petition filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89 (2007); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980). Even under this less stringent standard, however, this *pro se* petition is subject to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Serv.*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

#### Discussion

Petitioner states that he was convicted of hostage taking, knowingly exposing others to human immunodeficiency virus, criminal sexual conduct, and common law robbery in the Richland County Court of General Sessions on July 16, 2002. ECF No. 1, page 1. Petitioner was sentenced to life in prison without parole for the offenses. *Id.* Petitioner indicates that he filed a direct appeal of the convictions. *Id.* at 2. Petitioner also states that he has filed other petitions, applications, or motions concerning these convictions in state court, as recently as May 19, 2011. *Id.* at 3.

The present petition is the third § 2254 action filed by Petitioner with respect to his Richland County convictions.<sup>1</sup> Petitioner's first habeas petition, *David James v. Robert M.*

---

<sup>1</sup>The Court may take judicial notice of proceedings had before it in a prior suit with the same parties. *Mann v. Peoples First Nat. Bank & Trust Co.*, 209 F.2d 570, 572 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1954). See also *Colonial Penn Ins. Co. v. Coil*, 887 F.2d 1236, 1239 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989).

Stevenson, III., Civil Action Number 2:09-1227-TLW (D.S.C.), also challenged his July 2002 convictions for criminal sexual conduct (first degree), knowingly exposing others to human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), and taking hostages. Petitioner's first habeas action did not list a conviction for common law robbery and no such conviction appears in an online search of Richland County's court records. See *Richland County Fifth Judicial Circuit Public Index Search*, <http://www4.rcgov.us/publicindex/PISearch.aspx?> (search "David James") (last visited August 8, 2011). However, when Petitioner was sentenced in 2002, he was already serving a twenty-five (25) year sentence imposed by the Florence County Court of General Sessions in 1991 for the offenses of criminal sexual conduct (first degree), common law robbery, and breach of trust. See *David James v. Robert M. Stevenson, III.*, C/A No. 2:09-1227-TLW (D.S.C.) at ECF No. 24-1, page 386. Thus, it appears that Petitioner has confused his 1991 Florence County common law robbery conviction with his 2002 convictions in Richland County.<sup>2</sup> Petitioner's second habeas petition, *James v. South Carolina Department of Corrections*, Civil Action No. 8:11-00173-JMC (D.S.C.), was summarily dismissed as successive on April 6, 2011.

"Chapter 153 of Title 28 of the United States Code provides a statutory framework for federal post conviction relief from judgments of conviction entered in federal and state courts. Under this framework, individuals convicted of crimes in state courts seek federal habeas corpus relief through 28 U.S.C. § 2254." *In re Vial*, 115 F.3d 1192, 1194 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir.

---

<sup>2</sup> Petitioner has also filed a previous habeas petition challenging his 1991 Florence County convictions. See *David James v. Florence, et al.*, C/A No. 2:00-1518-DWS (D.S.C.) (dismissed without prejudice for failure to exhaust administrative remedies by an Order filed on July 3, 2000).

1997) (footnote omitted). On April 24, 1996, the President signed into law the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (the "AEDPA") which, in part, amended Chapter 153.

The AEDPA effected a number of substantial changes regarding the availability of federal post conviction relief to individuals convicted of crimes in federal and state courts. Of particular importance here are the provisions of the AEDPA codifying and extending judicially constructed limits on the consideration of second and successive applications for collateral relief. See *Felker v. Turpin*, 518 U.S. 651, [657] (1996). Under the AEDPA, an individual may not file a second or successive § 2254 petition for a writ of habeas corpus or § 2255 motion to vacate sentence without first receiving permission to do so from the appropriate circuit court of appeals.

*In re Vial*, 115 F.3d at 1194 (footnote omitted).

The "gatekeeping" mechanism created by the AEDPA amended § 2244(b) to provide:

The prospective applicant must file in the court of appeals a motion for leave to file a second or successive habeas application in the district court. § 2244(b)(3)(A). A three-judge panel has 30 days to determine whether "the application makes a prima facie showing that the application satisfies the requirements of" § 2244(b). § 2244(b)(3)(C); see §§ 2244(b)(3)(B), (D).

*Felker v. Turpin*, 518 U.S. 651, 657 (1996).

In order for this Court to consider a second or successive § 2254 petition, Petitioner must obtain a Pre-Filing Authorization from the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3). See *Gonzalez v. Crosby*, 545 U.S. 524, 530 (2005)("[B]efore the district court may accept a successive petition for filing, the court of appeals must determine that it presents a claim not previously raised that is sufficient to meet § 2244(b)(2)'s new-rule or actual-innocence provisions."). See also *In re: Williams*, 330 F. 3d 277 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003); *In re: Fowlkes*, 326 F. 3d 542 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003). Petitioner can obtain the necessary forms from the Clerk's Office of the United States Court of Appeals

for the Fourth Circuit. Because Petitioner did not obtain authorization from the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals to file the within petition in the district court, this Court does not have jurisdiction to consider it.

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the above-captioned case be dismissed *without* prejudice. See *Allen v. Perini*, 424 F.2d 134, 141 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1970) (federal district courts have duty to screen habeas corpus petitions and eliminate burden placed on respondents caused by ordering an unnecessary answer or return). Petitioner's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

August 9, 2011  
Greenville, South Carolina

s/Jacquelyn D. Austin  
United States Magistrate Judge

**Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
300 East Washington Street, Room 239  
Greenville, South Carolina 29601

**Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).